DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 585 HE 003 720

AUTHOR Allen, James E., Jr.
TITLE An Open University/External Degree Program for Massachusetts. Recommendations Concerning a Possible Organizational Structure.
PUB DATE 12 Oct 71
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Degree Requirements; Educational Opportunities; *External Degree Programs; *Higher Education; *Independent Study; *Special Degree Programs; *Statewide Planning; University Extension

ABSTRACT

Interest in the establishment of external degree programs and programs for off-campus higher education has been accelerated throughout the country by the recognition of the need for new approaches to the extension and improvement of higher education opportunity and for ways of reducing the cost of education to both students and taxpayers. State and national college proficiency examination programs were inaugurated during the past decade, continuing education programs expanded, and colleges without walls or open universities established. Increased emphasis on the external degree is a logical outgrowth of these developments. In spring 1971, the Chancellor of the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education appointed two study teams to (1) study the feasibility of an external degree program as a means of providing an alternate form of higher education in Massachusetts; and (2) develop recommendations concerning a possible administrative and organizational structure for the proposed external degree program. This document presents the results of the second study, and the conclusions and recommendations are based on information about the Massachusetts higher education system obtained from reports and memoranda, from analysis of legislation, from personal interviews with leaders of government and higher education, and from information about plans for the implementation of external degree programs elsewhere in the country. (Author/HS)

ED 071585

AN OPEN UNIVERSITY/EXTERNAL DEGREE PROGRAM FOR MASSACHUSETTS

Recommendations Concerning A Possible Organizational Structure

Prepared for
The Massachusetts Board of Higher Education

by

James E. Allen, Jr.
Lecturer in Education and Public Affairs
Woodrow Wilson School
Princeton University

October 12, 1971

HEdu 37730

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PRESENT ORGANIZATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN MASSACHUSETTS	3
III.	PREMISES	5
IV.	MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS IN THE EXTERNAL DEGREE MOVEMENT	7
V.	OPTIONS	11
VI.	DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS	12
VII.	RECOMMENDATIONS	18
VIII.	DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS	19
IX.	SOME FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE FOR EDUCATION IN THE COMMONWEALTH	25
X.	CONCLUSION	26

I. INTRODUCTION

Late in the Spring of 1971, Dr. Edward C. Moore, Chancellor of the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education, with the approval of the Board, commissioned Professor Jerrold R. Zacharias and his associates in the Education Research Center at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to examine the feasibility of an "external degree" program as a means of providing an alternate form of higher education in the Commonwealth. The report of that study, THE OPEN UNIVERSITY -- A Preliminary Report, has been completed.

At the same time, Chancellor Moore asked me to develop recommendations concerning a possible administrative and organizational structure for the proposed external degree program.

The conclusions and recommendations in this report are based on information about the Massachusetts higher education system obtained from reports and memoranda, from analysis of legislation, from personal interviews with leaders of government and higher education in the Commonwealth and in other states, and from information about plans for the implementation of external degree programs elsewhere in the country.

Interviews were held with the following people to whom I am indebted for their cooperation and assistance:

The Honorable Francis Sargent,
Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

The Honorable Donald R. Dwight,
Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth
of Massachusetts

Dr. Edward C. Moore,
Chancellor of the Board of Higher Education

Dr. Robert Wood,
President of the University of Massachusetts

Dr. Lawrence E. Dennis
Provost and Director of the Massachusetts
State College System

Dr. William G. Dwyer,
President of the Massachusetts Board of
Regional Community Colleges

Dr. Evan Collins,
Professor of Higher Education, Boston College

Dr. William Gaige,
Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education

Dr. Donald Nolan,
Director of New York State's College
Proficiency Examination Program

Dr. Arthur Chickering,
Vice President for Academic Affairs,
Empire State College

Mr. Ralph Dungan,
Chancellor of Higher Education of the
State of New Jersey

Dr. John R. Valley,
Educational Testing Service

Less formal discussions were held with several other individuals throughout the country who reacted to various possibilities under consideration and gave helpful advice.

Although this report and that of Professor Zacharias and his colleagues were prepared and submitted separately, coordination of the two parts of the study was maintained through regular and extensive meetings of the Zacharias group and me and my colleague, Mr. Ira Silverman of the Woodrow Wilson School of Princeton, University, who served as my assistant. The two reports are therefore interpendent and should be read together.

Interest in the establishment of external degree programs and programs for off-campus higher education has been accelerated throughout the country by the recognition of the need for new approaches to the extension and improvement of higher education opportunity and for ways of reducing the cost to both students and taxpayers. State and national "college proficiency examination" programs were inaugurated during the past decade, "continuing education" programs expanded, and "colleges without walls" or "open universities" established. Increased emphasis on the external degree is a logical outgrowth of these developments.

Interest in such a program for Massachusetts both as a means of tax saving and of expanding and improving educational opportunity was stimulated by the prediction of the Board of Higher Education that public higher education enrollment in the State would reach 216,000 students by 1980, or nearly three times the current total. During the past year several educational leaders in the State publicly expressed their support of the concept of the external degree and began a series of informal discussions on the subject. On April 1, 1971, Governor Francis Sargent announced his support, indicating his belief that such an opportunity should be a part of the overall higher education system of the State, and recommending that planning for it should go forward. The Board of Higher Education in their planning and coordinating role quickly moved to provide a focus for the growing interest by inaugurating this two-part study.

II. PRESENT ORGANIZATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN MASSACHUSETTS

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has twenty-nine public

institutions of higher education governed by five separate boards as follows:

- Three branches of the University of Massachusetts with a single Board of Trustees;
- Eleven state colleges governed by the Board of Trustees of State Colleges;
- Thirteen two-year community colleges governed by the Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges;
- Southeastern Massachusetts University with its own Board of Trustees;
- Lowell Technological Institute with its own Board of Trustees.

The five public higher education governing boards and their respective institutions comprise what are commonly called the "five segments" of public higher education in Massachusetts.

In 1965, under the Willis-Harrington Act (Chapter 572 of the Acts of 1965) the Board of Higher Education was established as a coordinating and planning board for the five segments.

In 1971, as part of the Governor's program for the reorganization of the State government, a new cabinet level position of Secretary of Educational Affairs was created "to provide a coordinated, integrated system of public education for citizens of all ages, to relate such a system effectively with privately-operated institutions, and to enrich the cultural quality of the environment." Just what the relationship of this officer will be to the Board of Higher Education and to the five segments of the public higher education system is not yet clear, and presumably will be worked out when an appointee assumes office.

In addition to the twenty-nine public institutions, there are 86 private colleges and universities in the Commonwealth

presently enrolling approximately 190,000 students.

III. PREMISES

Before considering the various options for the administrative organization of an open university/external degree program for Massachusetts, it is important to state the premises used in evaluating options. The premises believed to be of primary importance are:

1. A successfully structured external degree program should provide the highest possible degree of flexibility of operation. The nature of such a program and the ends it is intended to serve require that it be able to adjust readily to the wide and changing diversity of student needs and to the fluctuations of changing social and economic conditions.

2. An external degree program, designed to serve the entire state, should make maximum use of the existing educational structure. This would serve the dual purpose of (a) keeping costs as low as possible and avoiding unnecessary competition for limited financial and personnel resources, and (b) providing for the comprehensive and efficient use of all available resources for learning in the State.

These resources clearly include all the public institutions of higher education as well as all the private colleges and universities. They include television and radio facilities, correspondence schools, libraries, museums, art galleries and other cultural institutions; also continuing education schools, and many other institutions which, aside from their primary functions, provide educational services and opportunities, such as industrial training programs,

labor organizations, hospitals, social service agencies, etc.

3. The structure of the program should enable it to respond to the widest range of potential students. The organizational pattern should not prevent students from participating because of their home location or other factors such as age, income level, physical handicap, or cultural background. It should provide easy accessibility for the poor and minorities, including non-English speaking groups. (In this connection special attention should also be given to simplicity of procedures in such matters as enrollment, correspondence, fees.) It should make it easy for individuals to pursue education as a continuing process, enabling them to enter early (perhaps even before the completion of the standard high school grades), to step in and out of the Open University as circumstances and interests warrant, thus fitting the opportunities of the University into their total educational experience in ways most appropriate to their special needs and desires.

4. The organizational pattern should serve to enhance the credibility, prestige and reputation of the program and its degree. Extraordinary effort will be necessary to combat the "second class" status which too often has been the public impression of the value of equivalency or extension programs.

5. The structure should offer the utmost encouragement and opportunity for innovation. It should accommodate non-traditional policies regarding requirements for entry, employment and use of personnel, the curriculum, course grades and credits, scheduling and location of learning experiences, etc. It should not be dominated by professional forces having special interests in maintaining the educational status quo.

6. The structure should provide maximum protection from undue influence and control of partisan politics and special interests.

7. At this juncture the structure for a new educational program such as the open university/external degree should take into account not only the short range question of its place in the present organization for public higher education, but also the long-range possibility of a reorganized state structure for all of public education.

IV. MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS IN THE EXTERNAL DEGREE MOVEMENT

The new "open university" in Great Britain is one of the most talked about models in thie field. But because of the great differences between our systems, its development is, for the most part, germane only in a limited sense to this study.

In this country, the external degree-open university model which has progressed the furthest is that of New York State where there are two distinct programs -- the Regents External Degree Program, and the State University of New York Empire State College.

The Regents External Degree Program is essentially a degree-granting extension of the Regents College Proficiency Examination Program, which has been in operation for a decade. The CPEP offers examinations in many college-level subjects, which, when passed, can be accepted for credit at most higher education institutions, public and private, in the State of New York. The Regents new External Degree Program, which is expected to offer its first degrees in 1973, will enable a student to compile enough of these credits, in accordance with curricular requirements, to obtain a full-fledged degree. The degrees planned for the beginning of the program will be the Associate in Arts, equivalent to a two-year

community college degree, and a Bachelor in Business, equivalent to a four-year degree in that field. The Associate in Arts is almost developed, through the use of the College Level Examination Program, the Advanced Placement program, and other such tests in the humanities, and the social and natural sciences. The Bachelor in Business was selected primarily for the relative ease of defining the discrete major requirements of that field. The Director of the Regents program is of the opinion that a general liberal arts bachelor's degree will not be offered in the near future.

The Regents External Degree is offered under the degree granting authority of the State Board of Regents. The program has been built with assistance in the design and development of tests and requirements from higher education institutions in the State, public and private, from business and industrial concerns and other interested organizations.

The External Degree Program will provide three possibilities, or combinations of the three, for completing the requirements for the degree: examination, presentation of transcript credits, and assessment by a select panel of the student's achievements in and knowledge of a specific field of study. The development program is supported by an $800,000 grant to the New York State Education Department from the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation.

The New SUNY Empire State College is an open university program, also supported by a grant ($1,000,000) from the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation. Empire State College will be one of the SUNY institutions, equivalent in status to other SUNY units, but without a residential student body or centralized campus facilities. Its administrative office will be in Saratoga, New York

and it has projected plans for twenty regional learning centers by 1973, located around the State, each intended to serve approximately 500 students. In its basic features -- regional centers, mentors, and external examinations -- it is similar to both the British open university and the university proposed for Massachusetts in the Zacharias report.

This dual system of a degree-by-examination program offered by the Board of Regents and an open university operated as part of the State University evolved naturally out of New York State's tradition and organizational pattern.

No other state public higher education system has actually implemented an operational external degree or open university program as broad as that envisioned in Massachusetts or as that being developed in New York; no other state can therefore provide a model relevant for Massachusetts' planning. Some states have, however, made initial, limited starts which merit attention. Oklahoma, through its state regents, has authorized the establishment of a system of televised instruction as part of the state higher education system.[1] California has created a University of California Task Force on the Extended University, which later this year will release detailed recommendations regarding external degree and open university type programs to be established through the University of California.[2]

The New Jersey Board of Higher Education is currently at a stage roughly parallel to the situation in Massachusetts.

---

[1]John R. Valley. "An Inventory of External Degree Programs and Proposals," mimeo, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, p. 20.

[2]Ibid., May 1971 supplement, pp. 6-8.

A "proposal for Foundation support of the First Stages of Setting Up an Open College in New Jersey" has been drawn up, requesting funds to "permit the New Jersey State Board of Higher Education to move through two of four stages toward setting up an open college." The two stages are (1) assessing student demand and (2) planning, including the development and production of pilot courses. These two stages, expected to take two years, will be carried out by the New Jersey Board of Higher Education, through the planning office of the University College of Rutgers, the State University. An advisory board will consist of the Dean of Rutgers University College, and one representative from a community college, one from a state college, lay members, and the Chancellor of Higher Education. The second two stages will be (3) the production of multi-media courses and (4) the "coordination of the program of media offerings into an administrative system that allows students to earn degrees without being tied to a campus, including a baccalaureate to be awarded by an Open College in New Jersey or a transformed University College."[3]

Another effort deserving mention is the University Without Walls established by the Union for Experimental Colleges and Universities, headed by Dr. Samuel Baskin.

Seeking "to determine the common threads among existing plans for off-campus study, credit by examination, and external degrees" and "to see what kind of coherent philosophy could bring some kind of unity to the many efforts now underway," the Educational Testing Service and the College Entrance Examination Board have sponsored a National Commission on Non-Traditional Study. In addition,

---

[3] Ibid., p. 9

ETS maintains an inventory of proposed and on-going programs.

V. OPTIONS

Assessing the relevance of major developments in the external degree movement, and taking into consideration the existing arrangements for the governance and supervision of public higher education in Massachusetts, there are a number of structural arrangements, of varying degrees of practicality and desirability, that might be set up for the administration of the proposed external degree program in the Commonwealth.

A. The two basic components of the proposed external degree program -- the "examination" component and the "instructional" component -- could be established in separate organizational structures, with the Board of Higher Education awarding external degrees by examination, and the instructional "open university" program being operated under any of the systems (C-I) listed below. (This would be similar to the organizational structure in New York State.)

B. The board of Higher Education could act as the governing board over all aspects of the external degree program, including the instructional and examination, and the degree granting components.

C. There could be established a new and separate governing board, responsible for all aspects of the new program, organized under the general coordination of the Board of Higher Education with a relationship to the Board equivalent to that of the existing five segment boards.

D. There could be established a new and separate governing board, responsible for all aspects of the program, organized directly under and responsible to the new Secretary of Educational

Affairs in the Governor's Cabinet.

E. There could be a new and separate board under either the Board of Higher Education or the new Secretary of Educational Affairs responsible only for the instructional phase of the external degree program, leaving to the Board of Higher Education the responsibility for the examination-degree granting phase of the plan.

F. The University of Massachusetts could be authorized to administer the proposed program either (1) directly under the authority of the President and the Board of Trustees, separate from the existing faculties and campuses; or (2) attached to one or more of the existing faculties and campuses of the University.

G. The Board of Trustees of the State Colleges could administer the program, in either of the variations parallel to those discussed in (F) above.

H. The Board of Regional Community Colleges could administer the program, in either of the variations parallel to those discussed in (F) above.

VI. DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS

Option A. The primary advantage of the separation of the examination-degree granting and the instructional aspects of the proposed external degree programs appears to be one of expediency. By using the existing State Board of Higher Education, arrangements for the granting of degrees would not have to await the creation of the proposed Open University. (This assumes that the Board of Higher Education has the authority to grant degrees, a matter that needs legal clarification.) Thus, the State could respond with

relatively small expense and with comparative speed to the needs of a wide range of citizens seeking to gain credit based on their knowledge and previous study. This is a feature of the pattern employed in New York State.

One disadvantage of such an arrangement is that the separation of the two aspects under different boards would add to the difficulties of coordination and be confusing to the public. But a further and more serious disadvantage would be the involvement of the Board of Higher Education in operational matters, thus injecting a responsibility different in nature, and inappropriate and antithetical to its essential role as a planning and coordinating agency for all of higher education.

Option B. This option, which provides that the Board of Higher Education itself be authorized to assume total organizational and administrative responsibility for all aspects of the proposed Open University/external degree program, would have the advantage of utilizing an established mechanism without the necessity of adding to the system. It would also avoid jurisdictional difficulties that could arise from placing the new program under the supervision and control of one of the five segment boards. Thus, with the program not "belonging" to any one of the five segments, comprehensive and efficient use of the resources of the entire twenty-nine public colleges and universities would be easier. Moreover, because the Board of Higher Education is the central authority in the public higher education structure, it would be in a good position to draw on the other educational resources of the Commonwealth outside of the public system.

These advantages, would, however, have to be balanced against the fact that such total involvement in operational matters would virtually destroy the Board's usefulness as a coordinating and planning organization.

Option C. The option of creating a new and separate board responsible for all aspects of the new program under the general coordination of the Board of Higher Education with the relationship to the Board equivalent to that of the existing five segment boards, has a number of advantages.

It would provide visibility and status commensurate with the importance of the proposed program and ensure the identity made necessary by the special, non-traditional character of the open university-external degree concept.

It would provide the degree of independence necessary to maintain the integrity of the program and protect its non-traditional character.

Operating as a unit, not tied to traditional academic institutions, methods and practices, would help to ensure the flexibility and innovative opportunities that are the life-blood of a program that has responsiveness, diversity and mobility as its whole reason for being.

In terms of structural relationships, establishing the program under a board with status in the public higher education structure similar to that occupied by the five other segments -- but not part of any one of them, or of the Board of Higher Education -- would allow for maximum status with a minimum of inter-board conflict. With respect to the role of the Board of Higher Education itself, such an arrangement would add to the importance and responsibility of its

role and greatly increase its planning options.

Thus placed, the governing board of the proposed open university/external degree program would have an established claim in the allocation of state-wide support available to higher education, and would also have accessibility to state-wide institutional and personnel resources both within and without the educational system.

Establishment as a co-equal in the structure would facilitate the coordination and cooperation among the segments essential both for the unity and strength of the total higher education endeavor and for the most effective functioning of its individual parts.

This option also has, of course, disadvantages. The most serious is that it would further proliferate an already overly fragmented higher education structure.

It would entail the considerable overhead costs accompanying the establishment of a new governmental unit, and would increase the responsibility of an already overburdened, under-financed and under-staffed Board of Higher Education.

Option D. This option, establishing a new governing board responsible for all aspects of the program and placed under the Secretary of Educational Affairs in the Governor's Cabinet, would have the advantages of visibility, status, and identity referred to in the discussion of Option C, but it would not provide some of the advantages of cooperation and coordination possible with the placement of the new board under the Board of Higher Education.

Furthermore, it would have the serious drawback of opening the proposed program to possible direct partisan political influence and control.

Option E. The possibility of authorizing the Board of Higher Education to administer the examinations and grant the external degrees, but establishing the Open University or instructional phase of the program in a separate board under the Board itself or under the Secretary for Educational Affairs, would have the advantage of expediency mentioned in the discussion of Option A and also the advantages discussed in Options C and D relating to a separate board.

Here again, however, there would be the serious disadvantage of involving the top planning and coordinating board in an operational function.

Option F. To place the proposed new program under the aegis of the University of Massachusetts would have some clear advantages, particularly in terms of the prestige that the University would provide. Moreover, such an arrangement would be one building on existing state educational facilities. These advantages would pertain to either alternative available within this option -- a program administered by the President and the Board of Trustees, but separate from the existing campuses and faculties, or one connected directly with one or more of the University's campuses and faculties.

The main drawbacks would be that such an arrangement, tied to one of the segments, might not be able to draw fully on all state educational resources. More particularly in the case of the second alternative, tying the program to one campus

would limit the range of potential students. Moreover, it is possible that the utilization of an established institution and the presumable use of at least some of the existing faculty would reduce the possibilities for innovation. A more subtle but nonetheless important disadvantage would be the greater difficulty of maintaining the non-traditional emphasis in an operation so closely related to a more traditional one.

Options G and H. Some of the advantages cited in F above would pertain to the options of attaching the proposed program to the state college system or to the community college system. But the disadvantages would be much greater because the heavy governance and supervisory responsibilities of the governing boards of these systems, and the limited comprehensiveness of their institutions would make it difficult for them to expand their services to include the complete operation of a wide-scale open university/external degree program.

Option I. A franchise system in which the Board of Higher Education would be responsible for "packaging" materials and designs for an external degree program for the use of those colleges and universities which would choose to participate is attractive in that it would make use of existing educational facilities would be relatively simple to operate and could probably be implemented in a reasonable short time.

Such a program would, however, be uncertain as to scope, unwieldy in operation, less responsive to individual and regional variations of need, and subject to the limitations of institutional alliance. It would not have the unity and force of an agency devoted solely to the administration and operation of an external degree program.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

The "Preliminary Report" of the study committee, chaired by Professor Zacharias, proposes a new state university for Massachusetts -- The Open University -- intended to broaden access to learning opportunities by providing "A new form of higher education, one which is unencumbered by loyalties to existing academic structures and which is recognized as an equal partner with other colleges and universities in the state" and "... which, among its several innovative characteristics, will contain an external degree program."

This proposal is, in my judgment, a sound, forward-looking approach to increasing and strengthening the ability of the state to meet its expanding needs in higher education. The aim of the recommendations which follow is to provide the means for implementing the proposal for the Open University in ways that will make possible the imaginative program and procedures envisioned in the report of the Zacharias study committee.

After careful consideration of the various options deemed available, keeping in mind the premises stated in Section III, the following recommendations are made regarding the organizational and administrative structure for the open university/external degree program:

1. That the Commonwealth of Massachusetts create, under the Board of Higher Education, a new, separate board, appointed by the Governor, for the purpose of adminstering a new Open University.

2. That the Open University be headed by a president appointed by the new board.

3. That the Governor immediately appoint an Interim Planning Board charged with the responsibility of working out the detailed plans and procedures necessary for the establishment and the development of the University.

4. That immediate steps be taken by the Governor and the Legislature to provide for the Board of Higher Education the added strength necessary for the full exercise of its planning and coordinating role.

VIII. DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Together, these recommendations, among all the options, would best satisfy the two principal requirements for the immediate and long-range implementation of an open university/external degree program -- first, the urgency of a prompt beginning and second, the urgency of establishing at the start an administrative and organizational structure that would guarantee that the open university/external degree program will indeed be an innovative, new form of higher educational opportunity.

An immediate start would be possible through the prompt appointment by the Governor of the Interim Planning Board.

The goal of a separate, permanent board, under the Board of Higher Education, would offer the best guarantee of the degree of independence necessary to maintain the integrity of the program and protect its non-traditional character. This board, responsible for all aspects of the new program, would

also offer the best assurance of the important advantages of visibility, status, identity, coordination, and practical working relationships with the overall higher education system, along with the other advantages presented in the discussion of this option in an earlier section of this report.

These advantages are, in my view, powerful arguments for the recommended new board. There is no gain saying, however, that the proliferation of still another state board in the Massachusetts higher education system is a grave disadvantage, and this weighed heavily in the consideration of this recommendation. But any of the other choices that might avoid this proliferation did not seem so appropriate to the nature of the proposed program or to provide as suitable conditions for its successful development.

In the matter of costs, the same line of argument prevailed, for here again the choice had to be made primarily in terms of the structure most suitable to the objectives of the new program. Also the cost of this organizational arrangement has to be evaluated, as would that of any of the other options, in terms of the overall savings that can be expected from the open university/external degree approach to meeting the predicted large increase in the demand for higher education.

The creation of a separate board for the Open University under the Board of Higher Education obviously will add to the responsibility of the Board and make even more imperative the full exercise of its planning and coordination functions. Hence, it is of the utmost importance that the resources of this board be strengthened as proposed in Recommendation 4.

The importance of the work of the Interim Planning Board to ensuring the viability of the new enterprise cannot be overestimated. In this board is the key to a sound and orderly transition from proposal to operation.

Its responsibility will be not only that of planning but of gaining understanding and support for the Open University. This fact should strongly influence its makeup. The membership should first include representatives of each of the five segment boards and the Board of Higher Education. Their participation is vital in order to encourage support for the new program from existing institutions and to ensure that their interests will be fully considered in the developmental process.

The remaining members should be as representative as possible, consistent with the limited size generally considered expedient for a working group.

In addition to the attention it must give to plans for the Open University, the Interim Board should immediately seek to make arrangements for an "external degree" which could be put into operation quickly, pending the creation of the Open University.

The planning for the Open University should be done in terms of three primary goals:

1. The preparation of materials and procedures for both the teaching and evaluation functions

2. The projection of a budget for development and operation costs of the University for the first five years of its operation.

3. The design of legislation that may be required for the authorization and support of the University

The legislative authorization underlying the present structure of the Board of Higher Education and the five segments is the Willis-Harrington Act of 1965. The section which most directly empowers the Board of Higher Education with the responsibility for adult and continuing education is Section 7, Chapter 69, which reads: "The Board of Higher Education may cooperate with existing institutions of learning in the establishment and conduct of university extension and correspondence courses; may supervise the administration of all such courses supported in whole or in part by the Commonwealth; and, also, where deemed advisable, may establish and conduct such courses for the benefit of residents of the Commonwealth . . ." It would appear that this provision is sufficient to authorize the Board of Higher Education to give equivalency credit and perhaps even degrees by examination. There seems to be some question, however, whether the existing legislation is sufficient to empower the State to create the proposed new board or the new open-university/external degree program. It would seem advisable, therefore, to enact new legislation or to clarify the Willis-Harrington Act in order to assure the necessary legal authority.

Furthermore, it is imperative that any public higher education program as radically new and innovative as the proposed Open University have the support of prior public and legislative understanding and firm authorization.

The effective functioning of the Interim Board is dependent upon adequate funding. I concur with the figure of $300,000 to $500,000 suggested for beginning activities in the Zacharias Report as the amount required for achieving the goals fundamental to the Board's planning task.

The Interim Planning Board should have a short life, aiming for the completion of its work within a period of a year to eighteen months. With its task completed, the Interim Board would be replaced by the permanent Board of Trustees which would then be responsible for the operation and further development of the Open University and for the appointment of its administrative officers. However, if before that time, the Planning Board is successful in obtaining the substantial appropriations that ensure further development, it should be able to employ acting administrative officers, faculty members, mentors, and ancillary staff members in order to mount an experimental or pilot program along the lines suggested in the Zacharias group proposals.

It is not my responsibility to chart the detailed course of the development of the Open University. This would be the task first of the proposed Interim Planning Board and later of the permanent Board of Trustees. But in line with the request of Chancellor Moore that this study deal with organizational patterns, roles, and inter-institutional relationships, there are several points that I feel should be suggested for planning guidance.

It is expected that the Open University will extend the reach of higher education to a much broader cross-section of the public. Therefore, it is vital that the Board of Trustees in its composition reflect this breadth of representation. Its members should be drawn from a wide range of backgrounds and interests: education, leaders from business, industry, labor, and civic affairs. Strong representation of minority and low income interests is essential. Student representation should recognize the wide range of age, experience and goals of those to be served by the

University. Educators appointed to the board should serve as individuals, not as official representatives or spokesmen for other institutions. To avoid any conflict of interests, trustees of the Open University should not simultaneously be members of any other higher education board.

The new university will have to rely heavily upon the planning and coordinating role of the Board of Higher Education and will of course come under its requirements, as do the other boards, for review of budgets and the approval of degree programs. The support given to the Board of Higher Education has never been commensurate with either the scope or the importance of its assignment. The addition of new responsibility of the Open University, which puts a special premium on overall planning and coordination, highlights this inadequacy and makes imperative adequate financing, staffing, and the clarification and strengthening of the Board's authority.

The relationship of the Open University to the other public institutions of higher education makes essential the utmost cooperation between its board and the other segment boards since the new university will have to make extensive use of the facilities and other resources under their general control. Inter-institutional relationships will have to reflect the same close cooperation.

The foregoing discussion of the recommendations does not of course include all the points that will have to be considered in setting up the proposed Open University. But what has been said does, I believe, serve to justify the strong administrative and organizational structure of a separate board as the best means for establishing the proposed University in ways that will make possible

the imaginative program and procedures envisioned in the report of the Zacharias committee.

IX. SOME FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE FOR EDUCATION IN THE COMMONWEALTH

The trends and conditions now obtaining in education throughout the United States highlight the importance of strong organization and leadership at the state level. The growing inseparability and inter-dependence of all levels of education and all types of institutions, the broadening concept of education's responsibility, the inadequacy of traditional patterns of school finance, the special problems generated by the struggle for civil rights and social justice, the demand for improved performance and accountability in education, the need for greater flexibility and responsiveness, the increasing participation of the Federal Government, and the complexity and multiplicity of operations that today characterize the educational enterprise -- all of these are forcing increasing reliance on state leadership.

Amidst such complexity and pressing concerns, state government is severely handicapped in the effective exercise of educational leadership if there exists an unnecessarily confusing complexity in its own arrangements. An "unnecessarily confusing complexity," in my opinion, describes accurately the Massachusetts educational structure.

My study of the administrative and organizational plans for the proposed Open University has so emphasized this handicap that I cannot refrain from including in this report a strong

recommendation that the Governor and the Legislature should move promptly to simplify the State's arrangements for education. There should be a reorganization that would create a state board that would be responsible for overseeing the planning and coordination of all of public education -- elementary, secondary and higher -- with three major boards under it for the governance of the various elements of the public education enterprise, a board for elementary and secondary education, a board for the Open University, and a board for all the rest of public higher education, formed by a consolidation of the present five segment boards and their units into one state university system.

X. CONCLUSION

The State of Massachusetts is to be commended for its interest in seeking to incorporate the open university/external degree concept in its provision for higher education opportunities. The State has historically been a leader in education and it is to be hoped that the same vision and leadership will be exercised in promoting this new program which holds so much promise for the people of the State.